

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4 – 9 and 11 - 20 remain pending in the present case.

## RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

The present Office Action makes several alleged characterizations of the Goldman reference disclosure. Applicants respectfully assert the present Office Action alleged characterizations of the Goldman reference teachings are overreaching and irreconcilable as set-forth below. For example, the present Office Action alleges the Goldman reference discloses sending an authorization request, *or indicator*, to the purported sender address ([0063])[Page 3 lines 4 - 5 of the present Office Action]. Applicants respectfully assert the “*or indicator*” is *inconsistent* and *not reconcilable* with the disclosure of Goldman reference to the extent the Goldman reference may mention the person *must provide* an accurate *response to the request* [0058].

## 103 REJECTIONS

The present Office Action rejects Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kaminski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0044155A1) in view of Goldman (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0233418A1). Applicant respectfully asserts that the present invention is neither shown nor suggested by the Kaminski et al. and Goldman references alone or together in combination.

The present Office Action acknowledges the Kaminski et al. reference does not teach verifying the source address included in the received electronic message against the address the authorization indicator is sent to. Applicant respectfully asserts the Goldman reference does not overcome these and other shortcomings of the Kaminski et al. reference.

The present Office Action alleges the Goldman reference discloses sending an authorization request, *or indicator*, to the purported sender address ([0063])[Page 3 lines 4 - 5 of the present Office Action]. Applicant respectfully points out that the *or indicator* language is *not a direct quote* from the Goldman reference [0063]. To the extent the allegation of the present Office Action is attempting to characterize the Goldman reference as disclosing sending an authorization request, *or indicator*, to the purported sender address ([0063])[Page 3 lines 4 - 5 of the present Office Action], Applicants respectfully assert the *alleged characterization of "or indicator"* is *inconsistent* and *not reconcilable* with the disclosure of Goldman reference. To the extent the Goldman reference may mention *sending a request* to a manager of a domain or a purported *sender* [0063 line 3], Applicants respectfully assert the *request* of the Goldman reference is *not* an authorization *indicator*. Furthermore, to the extent the Goldman reference may mention the person *must provide* an accurate *response to* the

*request* [0058], Applicants respectfully assert the *request* of the Goldman reference is *not* an authorization *indicator*. Applicants respectfully assert the present Office Action allegation is inconsistent because if the request is an authorization indicator the person would already have the authorization indicator and would not have to provide an accurate response to the request to get authorization.

In addition, to the extent the Goldman reference may mention *sending* a *request* electronic message to a manager of the domain of the sender's address, [and].... the *manager* can verify whether the purported sender's address is in fact a *valid domain* address [Paragraph 63], Applicant respectfully asserts the Goldman reference does not teach verifying a source address included in the received electronic message against an *address the authorization indicator is sent to*. In addition, to the extent the Goldman reference may mention a *data structure 18* has fields and an authorized category [paragraph 44] and the *data structure 18* is in recipient's computer 12 [Figure 3A], Applicant respectfully asserts the Goldman reference *does not teach* an authorization indicator *is sent*, and therefore Applicant respectfully assert the Goldman reference does not teach verifying source address against an address *the authorization indicator is sent to*.

The present Office Action rejects claims 11 and 17 for the same reasons as Claim

1. To the extent Claims 11 and 17 are similar to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts Claims 11 and 17 are allowable for similar rationale to the arguments presented above.

With respect to Claim 11, to the extent the Goldman reference may mention sending a *request* to a manager of a domain or a purported *sender* [0063 line 3], Applicants respectfully assert the *request* of the Goldman reference is *not* an authorization *indicator* and the Goldman reference does not teach verifying an address of a source included in an unsolicited electronic message against an address an *authorization indicator is sent to.*

With respect to Claim 17, to the extent the Goldman reference may mention sending a *request* to a manager of a domain or a purported *sender* [0063 line 3], Applicants respectfully assert the *request* of the Goldman reference is *not* an authorization *indicator* and the Goldman reference does not teach *forwarding* an unsolicited electronic message *with* said verification indication to an address said verification indication was sent from.

Applicant respectfully asserts Claims 2 – 9, 12 – 16 and 18 – 20 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claims 1, 11 and 17 respectively.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application. Applicant respectfully petitions for a 2 Month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 and is including the fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.17. If an additional extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefore. Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Date: 10/23/2008

/John F. Ryan/

John F. Ryan.  
Reg. No. 47,050  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060